

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

Г	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
	09/879,597	06/12/2001	Nobuhide Matsuda	F-7030	3595
	7590 07/27/2004			EXAMIN	NER
	Jordan and Ha			RODRIGUEZ, GLENDA P	
	122 East 42nd Street New York, NY 10168			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•			2651	\sim
				DATE MAILED: 07/27/2004	, 9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summan	09/879,597	MATSUDA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Glenda P. Rodriguez	2651				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a rep y within the statutory minimurn of thirty (will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH , cause the application to become ABAI	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <i>04 May 2004</i> .						
,						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
 5)⊠ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-10 is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) 5 is/are rejected. 7)⊠ Claim(s) 6 is/are objected to. 	 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. ☑ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-10 is/are allowed. ☑ Claim(s) 5 is/are rejected. 					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
0) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	,	•				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. Is have been received in Ap Inity documents have been re U (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	n□	(DTO 442)				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		/Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
S. Potent and Trademark Office						

Application/Control Number: 09/879,597

Art Unit: 2651

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (Fig. 4). Applicant's prior art Fig. 4 discloses a particle monitoring method for evaluating cleanliness in a magnetic transfer apparatus including: measuring particles within the magnetic transfer (16); specifying a source of particles based on the number of particles measured at the location and the number of particles measured in a time series (particle counter 17); and evaluating the cleanliness in the magnetic transfer apparatus based on the measurement results (evaluating the results of 15). Applicant's Prior Art Fig. 4 fails to teach measuring particles by a plurality of particle measurement devices at a plurality of dispersed measurement locations. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide duplicate measurement devices (Prior Art Fig. 4, Elements 15-17) to the magnetic transfer apparatus of Applicant's Prior Art Fig. 4 for improving the accuracy of the particle monitoring device. In addition, it has been held that the mere duplication of essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bernis Co., 193 USPA.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Page 3

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding Claim 6, the primary reason for allowable subject matter is the limitation wherein the evaluation on cleanliness is based on the numbers of particles measured in a time series at each of the measurement locations and a mean value of the measurement results.

Claim 1-4 and 7-10 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Regarding Claim 1, the primary reason for allowance is the inclusion of the limitation wherein a plurality of particle measurement devices having suction ports fixed in dispersed positions in the base plate such that dispersion characteristics of contaminants is determinable with the casing entirely enclosing members.

Regarding Claim 7-10, their primary reason for allowance is in Paper # 7, dated 1/29/2004.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2651

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenda P. Rodriguez whose telephone number is (703) 305-8411. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday: 7:00-5:00; alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran can be reached on (703) 305-0400. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

มนา ไมไง 26, 2004. SINH TRAN PRIMARY EXAMINER